

THE SPRINKLER.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM

VIEWED FROM

A NEW STAND-POINT.

BY THE REV. J. H. NICHOLS,

Author of "Grub-ax," "Pump," "Furnace," etc.

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR.

PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH.

SMITH & LAMAR, AGENTS, NASHVILLE, TENN.

1911.

Price, 10c. per copy; \$1 per dozen, by mail postage paid.

UG22

N51

Gift of
Mrs. George F. Barton

THE
SANDFORD FLEMING
LIBRARY



Accession No.

Date

GEORGE F. BARTON
48 EAST WELDON
PHOENIX, ARIZONA

THE SPRINKLER.

THE MODE OF BAPTISM

VIEWED FROM

A NEW STANDPOINT.

BY THE REV. J. H. NICHOLS,

Author of "Grub-Ax," "Pump," "Furnace," etc.

NASHVILLE, TENN.; DALLAS, TEX.:
PUBLISHING HOUSE OF THE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH.
SMITH & LAMAR, AGENTS.
1911.

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

UG22
N51

STACKS

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1882, by
J. H. NICHOLS,
In the Office of the Librarian of Congress, at Washington.

BERKELEY BAPTIST DIVINITY SCHOOL
SANDFORD FLEMING LIBRARY

THE SPRINKLER.

NO DIP IN THE BIBLE, BUT SPRINKLE, POUR.
(171)

THE SPRINKLER.

“So shall he *sprinkle* many nations.” (Isaiah lii. 15.) “Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you.” (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) “For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and *sprinkled* both the book and *all the people*.” (Heb. ix. 19.) That all of the above texts refer to the mode of baptism is clear to my mind, and as our Campbellite friends have founded their immersion on *supposition* and not on Scripture, it is hoped that this little *Sprinkler* will set aside the unscriptural *dip* and establish in the mind of the reader the true Bible mode of baptism—SPRINKLE. *Carefully read and inwardly digest* the contents of the *Sprinkler*, and if you derive any benefit therefrom, the author will be amply repaid for the labor bestowed on this little messenger.

INTRODUCTION.

THAT *pouring* or *sprinkling* water upon the subjects in every case of baptism recorded in the Bible would have been exactly convenient without *adding to* or *taking from* the Bible account *one word, syllable, or letter* will hardly be denied. That in the majority of baptisms recorded in the word of God *immersion* would have been *altogether inconvenient*, and in some cases *impossible*, unless we *suppose* something which the Bible does not say, will not likely be denied except by *immersionists*. That *sprinkle* and *pour* are used in the Bible in reference to baptism few honest Bible readers will deny. That *immerse* or *dip* is ever used in the Bible with reference to baptism no one can prove. "Give us *chapter* and *verse* for *sprinkle* and *pour* having reference to baptism," you say. "Then will I *sprinkle clean water upon you*." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) Was not this prophecy fulfilled in the baptism of the three thousand at Pentecost as shown in this pamphlet? If not, tell us *when* and *where* it was fulfilled. "I will *pour out my spirit upon all flesh*." (Joel ii. 28; Acts ii. 17.) Was not this spoken in reference to the *mode* of *Holy Ghost baptism*? If not, to what did it refer? Reader, "inquire within," and I think you will find clear Bible proof that *sprinkle, pour*, is the scriptural mode of baptism, and that the best that can be done to prove *immersion* must be done by *supposition*, and not by Scripture.

THE AUTHOR.

CHAPTER V.

THE SPRINKLER.

Campbellite. Brother Methodist, I am glad to meet you, and I hope we can spend an hour profitably talking on the mode of baptism. I have many things to say to you on that subject.

Methodist. Yes, sir; if you say much to me, I suppose you will have something to say about baptism, for that is what you Campbellites generally talk about; but say on, I will hear you.

Campbellite. Well, sir, what I want to say to you is this: It seems so strange to me that you Methodists should oppose us so strongly on the mode of baptism, when we *do* and *teach* on this subject just as Christ, John the Baptist, the apostles, and the early Christians *did and taught*. We baptize just as John baptized Christ, and just as the apostles baptized. We observe *every item* connected with the baptisms recorded in the New Testament, *just as they were observed by John, Jesus, and the apostles*. Now why do you oppose us?

Methodist. We oppose you because you are in one respect like the Pharisees: "you *say*, and *do not*." I know that you proclaim to the world that you baptize just as Jesus was baptized and just as the apostles baptized, observing every point connected with baptism just as they occurred in connection with the New Testament baptisms, but you do not.

Campbellite. Will you please show me any thing connected with Christ's baptism that we do not observe?

Methodist. I will. Let me number the items wherein Campbellite baptisms differ from Christ's baptism. (1) "Then *cometh* Jesus . . . unto John, to be baptized of him." (Matt. iii. 13.) Do Campbellite preachers wait for people to *come to them* to be baptized?

Campbellite. No, b-u-t—

Methodist. Hold a moment! Don't you *run after them*, even after members of other Churches, and *urge them* to let you baptize them?

Campbellite. I don't wish to answer that question.

Methodist. (2) "But John forbade him." (Verse 14.) Did you ever know a Campbellite preacher to *forbid* any one who came to be baptized of him?"

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (3) Jesus came to John *without faith*, for he "knew all things." Do you baptize people who have no faith?

Campbellite. Of course not.

Methodist. (4) Christ came to John *without repentance*, for he "knew no sin." Do you baptize *impenitent persons*?

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (5) Jesus *made no confession*, for he had no sins to confess. Do you baptize people who make no confession?

Campbellite. Of course not.

Methodist. (6) Christ was *perfectly pure*; no sin, no guile, no condemnation was upon him. Do you not publish to the world that you would not *for your right arm* baptize a *pure, holy person* who had never sinned?

Campbellite. Certainly we do.

Methodist. (7) When Jesus was baptized "Lo, the

heavens were opened unto him." (Verse 16.) Did you ever know such a thing to occur at a Campbellite baptism?

Campbellite. You know that was a miracle, and why do you talk such foolishness?

Methodist. You may call it foolishness if you please, but you have boasted so loud and so long about *doing just like Christ and his apostles did* that I have made up my mind to show the world just how far you miss it. Now for the eighth point: "And he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him." (Verse 16.) Any thing like that at your baptisms?

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (9) "And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." (Verse 17.) Did you ever hear a voice from heaven at a Campbellite baptism?

Campbellite. No, sir; that was in the days of miracles, and I think it is foolish for you to ask such questions.

Methodist. But did it ever occur to you that the baptism of Jesus and all the baptisms recorded in the New Testament occurred in the days of miracles—yea, and *every word of the Old and New Testaments was written in the days of miracles*; but you Campbellites have a very convenient arrangement. You proclaim to the world, "Come, behold a people who preach the old apostolic gospel, a people who do and teach just as Jesus and his apostles taught and did. Come, join us and be like the early Christians;" and when we begin to show you many points of difference you cry out, "Foolishness! foolishness! days of mir-

acles! days of miracles!" But let me call your attention to the tenth point: "And Jesus himself began to be about thirty years of age." (Luke iii. 23.) Do you require your subjects for baptism to wait till they are about thirty years of age before you baptize them?

Campbellite. No, sir; we baptize them as soon as they commit sin, and believe, repent, confess, regardless of age.

Methodist. And yet you do *just like Christ did* (?). Now I have shown you ten points of difference between the baptism of Christ and Campbellite baptism; will you please show me *one* point of agreement?

Campbellite. O yes! "And Jesus, when he was baptized, *went up straightway out of the water.*" (Matt. iii. 16.) This shows *beyond a doubt* that Jesus was immersed, and that is just like we do; we always immerse because Jesus was immersed.

Methodist. That is, you *suppose* he was immersed; the Bible does not say he was. But the *ten points* of disagreement *amount to nothing* if you can find one point of agreement, and that point based on *supposition*! Do you think that John baptized Jesus by the same mode by which he baptized all the people?

Campbellite. Of course he did; John immersed all he baptized, for nothing is baptism but immersion.

Methodist. Then we will see if we can learn from the Bible just how John did baptize. Moses said: "The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken." (Deut. xviii. 15.) Also, in verse 18, God said: "I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, *like unto thee.*" Now do you think this prophet was to be *like unto*

Moses in personal appearance, or was he to preach the law and administer the ordinances of the Church after the manner of Moses?

Campbellite. Of course it would be of no importance that he should be like unto Moses in personal appearance. No one would contend for that, I suppose.

Methodist. The Jews were on the watch for "that prophet" who would *preach and administer the ordinances* of the Church as Moses did, and when John the Baptist began his public ministry he attracted the attention of the scribes and Pharisees, *because he did so much like Moses* they thought he must be "*that prophet*;" so they "sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?" (John i. 19.) "And they asked him, Art thou Elias? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that Prophet? And he answered, No." (Verse 21.) "And they asked him, and said unto him, WHY BAPTIZETH THOU THEN, *if thou be not that Christ, nor Elias, neither that Prophet?*" (Verse 25.) Here it is plain that the point of similarity between John's work and the work of Moses was *his baptism*, for the priests and Levites were particularly impressed with this point of similarity, hence they asked: "WHY BAPTIZEST THOU THEN?"

Campbellite. Just so; but what does that prove in regard to the mode of baptism practiced by John?

Methodist. Just this: Paul tells *just how Moses baptized*. Turn to Hebrews ix. 19: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, AND SPRINKLED BOTH THE BOOK AND ALL THE PEOPLE." This settles the question as to the mode of baptism prac-

ticed by Moses. HE SPRINKLED ALL THE PEOPLE, thus baptizing them *with water*; so when John came baptizing *with water*, for John answered them, saying, "I BAPTIZE WITH WATER" (John i. 26), his baptism so exactly agreed with Moses *sprinkling all the people* that it is easy to see why the priests and Levites took him for that prophet who should be *like unto Moses*. And when we consider that Moses and John lived under the same dispensation, that Moses *sprinkled all the people*, and that John *baptized with water*, it is clear that he did not *immerse Jesus*, but SPRINKLED THE WATER UPON HIM like Moses *sprinkled all the people*.

Campbellite. I fail to see your point, for when Moses spoke of that prophet who was to be like unto him he did not have reference to John the Baptist, but to Christ.

Methodist. That does not affect the question, for John and Jesus surely baptized by the same mode, for "Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John, (though Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples.)" (John iv. 1, 2.) That is, the disciples baptized under the immediate supervision of Jesus, and of course by the same mode by which Moses and John baptized—that is, *sprinkled water upon all the people*—and this shows us that the apostles *did not immerse*.

Campbellite. I do not exactly see your point, but you have shown ten points of difference between Christ's baptism and our baptism; is there any other difference?

Methodist. Yes, sir, in the *design* of baptism; you teach that water baptism is for (in order to) the remission of sins. Jesus was not baptized for the remission of sins, was he?

Campbellite. No, sir; and to tell you the truth, it has never been very clear to my mind what he was baptized for.

Methodist. That is an honest confession, and now you see I have shown you *eleven* points of difference between Christ's baptism and Campbellite baptism, and you have only tried to show one point of agreement, and that was based upon a *supposition*, and I have shown you by "thus saith the Lord" that your supposition is wrong; *that Jesus was not immersed*; that John and the apostles *did not immerse*.

Campbellite. We will leave the baptism of Jesus, if you please; but I am sure, if we turn to the second chapter of Acts, we will find that the *three thousand* were immersed on the day of Pentecost.

Methodist. Very well; we will see how many points of agreement we can find between the baptism at Pentecost and Campbellite baptism. (1) "The number of the names together were about a hundred and twenty." (Acts i. 15.) Do you have just a hundred and twenty disciples together preparatory to baptism?

Campbellite. O no! that is not essential.

Methodist. Is it not common for you Campbellites to cry publicly: "The Methodists are always talking about things in the Bible that are *non-essential* to salvation. We know no *non-essentials* in God's word; every thing in the Bible is *essential*, or God would not have put it there;" and here you say is something "*not essential*." But we will notice the second point: "They were all with *one accord in one place*." (Acts ii. 1.) Are you Campbellites *all of one accord*? are you in *love and harmony among yourselves*?

Campbellite. Not exactly; we have considerable difference of opinion about organs in churches, missionary societies, etc., and bad feelings often arise, and even split the Church in some places.

Methodist. That is bad indeed; but (3) "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven." (Verse 2.) Do you hear a *sound* from heaven preparatory to baptism?

Campbellite. Of course not; that was a miracle.

Methodist. (4) That sound was "as of a rushing mighty wind, and it filled all the house where they were sitting." (Verse 2.) The like of that never occurs in an assembly of Campbellite elders just before they baptize the people, does it?

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (5) "And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them." (Verse 3.) Any thing like that ever occur with Campbellite elders?

Campbellite. Certainly not; that was a miracle.

Methodist. (6) "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." (Verse 4.) Are you filled with the Holy Ghost before baptizing people?

Campbellite. O no; that was another miracle.

Methodist. (7) "And began to speak with other tongues." (Verse 4.) Do your elders speak with other tongues?

Campbellite. No, sir; of course not.

Methodist. (8) They began to speak, not what they had learned, but "as the Spirit gave them utterance." (Verse 4.) Does the Spirit ever *fill* your elders and *give them utterance*?

Campbellite. That was in the days of miracles.

Methodist. (9) Such was the joy and speech of the disciples that some supposed them to be "full of new wine." (Verse 13.) Do your elders ever get enough of the Holy Ghost in them to cause them to act as the apostles did on this occasion?

Campbellite. Well, we are getting so now that some of our more excitable members shout a little occasionally, but we regard that as more the result of excitement than a result of the Holy Ghost in them.

Methodist. (10) In Peter's sermon at Pentecost, before he said *one word about baptism*, the people were "*pricked in their heart*," and said: "Men and brethren, what shall we do?" (Verse 37.) Did you ever see *just such an occurrence* under a Campbellite sermon?

Campbellite. I cannot say that I ever did.

Methodist. (11) When Peter told them to "be baptized for the remission of sins," he added, "and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Verse 38.) Do your elders always promise the "gift of the Holy Ghost" to those whom they baptize?

Campbellite. No, sir; and really I do not know that we are very well settled in our minds as to just what the gift of the Holy Ghost is. Most of us think it was confined to the apostolic age, or days of miracles.

Methodist. Now, we have seen *eleven* points of difference between things connected with the baptism of the three thousand at Pentecost and Campbellite baptisms, and many of these points you *utterly refuse to claim now*, and there is not one of those points which you hold as essential to a scriptural baptism now; yet you continue to tell the people: "We do in all things just as Christ and his apostles did. The Bible is our creed: *we go by it to the letter*." Now

please tell me just what was connected with the baptism of the three thousand at Pentecost that exactly agrees with Campbellite baptism.

Campbellite. Why, the three thousand were immersed, and we practice immersion. That's the point of agreement.

Methodist. Then you think nothing connected with the Pentecost baptisms is essential now but the *mode*.

Campbellite. Well, we know they were *immersed*, and we *immerse*.

Methodist. But let me show you how much you are mistaken about that. Let us read a prophecy which is recorded in Ezekiel xxxvi. 24-27. This prophecy was made to the Jews. God said to them: "For I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land. (Verse 24.) Now, *what was the Jews' own land?* and *when was this prophecy fulfilled?*"

Campbellite. The land of Judea was the Jews' own land, but I do not know when this prophecy was fulfilled.

Methodist. Let us see if we cannot find its fulfillment in the second chapter of Acts, where it is plainly stated that "there were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men, *out of every nation under heaven.*" (Acts ii. 5.) The land of Judea was the Jews' own land, you say, and to this all agree. Now, here is the fulfillment of that prophecy--the Jews were to be *taken out of all lands and brought into their own land.* Now here they are on the day of Pentecost, "*out of every nation under heaven*"--*in their own land.* Does not this look like the fulfillment of that prophecy?

Campbellite. I must confess that it does.

Methodist. Then let us take the next verse in the prophecy: "Then will I *sprinkle clean water upon you*, and ye shall be clean." (Verse 25.) Remember, this *clean water* was to be *sprinkled upon them* when they came into their own land. Now let us turn to Acts ii. 41, and see the fulfillment of this point in the prophecy: "Then they that gladly received his word WERE BAPTIZED." "*Sprinkled clean water*"—"were baptized." That looks like the fulfillment of that prophecy, does it not?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, it may look so to you, but it is not so plain to me. Are there any other points in the prophecy that were fulfilled at Pentecost?

Methodist. Yes, sir. In verse 26 of the prophecy we read, "And a new spirit will I put within you;" and in Acts ii. 4 we read, "And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost." Also, in verse 38, Peter said to all who would be baptized: "And ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." Again in the prophecy (verse 27) we read, "And ye shall keep my judgments, and do them;" and in the fulfillment (Acts ii. 42) we read, "And they continued steadfastly in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Now, I have given you the four important points in the prophecy, and their fulfillment at Pentecost, and it is clearly shown that the three thousand were not *dipped into the water*, but CLEAN WATER WAS SPRINKLED UPON THEM. Is not that plain enough? Were the three thousand immersed?

Campbellite. Somehow I can't now think of the chapter and verse by which we prove they were immersed, but can you tell me why it is so definitely stated that *clean water* should be sprinkled upon them?

Methodist. The shedding forth of *clean water* upon those who are baptized is a picture of the *shedding forth* of the Holy Ghost upon those who are cleansed from sin by the “washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he *shed on us abundantly* through Jesus Christ our Saviour.” (Tit. iii. 5, 6.) Now as the baptismal water is a *type* or *picture* of the Holy Ghost, it must be *clean water*, so you see the *exceeding unfitness* of dipping a person into *muddy water* for baptism.

Campbellite. I believe I am willing to dismiss this case now, if you please.

Methodist. Of course, then, you agree that the circumstances connected with the baptism of the three thousand at Pentecost do not agree with Campbellite baptisms.

Campbellite. I am not prepared to say just what I believe about that now, but if it suits you we will take up the baptism of the Samaritans, recorded in the eighth chapter of Acts. I am very sure they were immersed.

Methodist. We have seen that Jesus was not immersed, and that the three thousand at Pentecost were not immersed, and at your request we will notice the baptism of the Samaritans. Now if we stick to the *written word*, you will see that there is but one way for you to get immersion out of this case, and that is you will just *suppose* the Samaritans were immersed, for the record does not even *intimate* that they were. We will notice the points connected with the case in order, and see how many of them will suit Campbellite baptism. (1) When Philip preached in Samaria “unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of

many that were possessed with them." (Acts viii. 7.) Did you ever know a thing of that kind to precede a Campbellite baptism?

Campbellite. No, sir; that was a miracle.

Methodist. (2) "And many taken with palsies . . . were healed." (Verse 7.) Does that suit Campbellism?

Campbellite. No.

Methodist. (3) "And many . . . that were lame were healed." (Verse 7.)

Campbellite. All that was in the days of miracles.

Methodist. (4) When Simon was baptized "he continued with Philip, and wondered, beholding the miracles and signs which were done." (Verse 13.) Does that suit Campbellite baptism?

Campbellite. No; we would ridicule such a thing.

Methodist. (5) After the people had been baptized the apostles at Jerusalem "sent unto them Peter and John." (Verse 14.) Do you Campbellites acknowledge the right of any body of ministers to send preachers where they choose to send them?

Campbellite. No, sir; that is the *Methodist* way.

Methodist. (6) When Peter and John reached Samaria they "prayed for them, *that they might receive the Holy Ghost.*" (Verse 15.) Do you send ministers to pray for those whom you have immersed, that they might receive the Holy Ghost?

Campbellite. No; nonsense!

Methodist. (7) "For as yet he was fallen upon none of them." (Verse 16.) Do you teach that it is necessary for the Holy Ghost to *fall upon* those whom you have baptized?

Campbellite. No; sins are pardoned in the act of

immersion, and that is all there is of it; no miracles now.

Methodist. (8) "Then laid they their hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost." (Verse 17.) Is this done to those whom you baptize, and do they receive the Holy Ghost through the laying on of hands?

Campbellite. No; that was in the days of miracles.

Methodist. But you must remember that you are always telling the world that you *do* and *teach* just as Jesus and his apostles did and taught; now, I have given you a few things which the Bible says were connected with the baptism of the Samaritans, and you will not have them; but you contend for what the Bible does not say. You claim that the Samaritans were *immersed*, and the Bible does not say *any such thing*. So you reject what the Bible does say, and contend earnestly for what it *does not say*. Yea, you make *immersion* essential to salvation, and the Bible does not say *one word about immersion*. Come, brother, just open your eyes one moment, and see how inconsistent you are, and quit being so cross with us Methodists because we cannot agree that you are right in contending for *immersion* when the Bible is perfectly silent—yea, *silent as death about immersion*.

Campbellite. Well, we will take the baptism of the eunuch, if you please, for I am sure he was immersed.

Methodist. Very well; we will look at a few things connected with the eunuch's baptism, and see how they accord with your way of baptizing. (1) "And the angel of the Lord spake unto Philip, saying, Arise, and go toward the South, unto the way that goeth down from Jerusalem unto Gaza, which is desert." (Acts viii. 26.) Do angels ever speak to Campbellite

preachers, telling them where to go to baptize some one?

Campbellite. Foolishness! foolishness! That was in the days of miracles.

Methodist. God does not even call Campbellite preachers to preach, I believe.

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, no.

Methodist. (2) When Philip came to where the eunuch was he found him reading the book of "Esaias the prophet." (Verse 28.) Now, if Philip had been a Campbellite preacher, would he not have told the eunuch that he never could learn what to do to be saved by reading that book; that he must read the "Acts?"

Campbellite. Of course sinners must read the Acts to learn what to do to be saved. Esaias belonged to the Jewish dispensation.

Methodist. (3) "*Then the Spirit said unto Philip, Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.*" (Verse 29.) Does the Spirit ever speak to you?

Campbellite. Never, only through the *written word*.

Methodist. (4) "The eunuch said, See, here is water; what doth hinder me to be baptized?" (Verse 36.) Do you wait for sinners to *call for baptism*?

Campbellite. No; I urge all sinners to be baptized *for the remission of sins*.

Methodist. But the record does not show that Philip said *one word* to the eunuch about baptism till the eunuch called for it. But (5) there is not *one word* said about *immersion* in connection with the Scripture the eunuch was reading, but just *seven verses* from where he was reading, it is written: "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." (Isa. lii. 15.) But you think the eu-

nuch was *immersed*. Well, the record says *sprinkle*, and you say *immerse*. How is that? You go by the Bible, you say.

Campbellite. Why certainly the eunuch was *immersed*, for "they went down both INTO THE WATER, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him." (Acts viii. 38.) That settles the mode beyond a doubt. The eunuch certainly was *immersed*. Why did they go down into the water if not to immerse?

Methodist. The book says "he baptized him," so this was what they went down into the water for, but by what mode?

Campbellite. By immersion, of course; the record clearly shows this.

Methodist. Then I will give you a similar statement, and get you to tell me *just how* Benaiah slew the lion. He "went down also and slew a lion in the midst of a pit in time of snow." (2 Sam. xxiii. 20.) Now notice carefully these important points. 1. "He went down." 2. "He slew a lion." 3. "In the midst of a pit." 4. "In time of a snow." Now with these points before you, of course you can tell me *just how* Benaiah slew that lion. Did he strangle him, beat him with a club, stab him with a spear, or did he kill him in some other way?

Campbellite. I am sure I cannot tell you *how* he slew him, for the word does not say *how*; it only states *where* he slew him, and how could any one tell *how* he slew him if he goes by the record alone?

Methodist. Just like you Campbellites tell that the eunuch was immersed: you just suppose he was, when the word comes just as near telling *just how* Benaiah slew that lion as it does telling that the eunuch was

immersed. All you could do toward telling *how* the lion was slain would be a *mere guess*, but suppose just *seven verses* from this account we should find this statement, "So shall he *spear* many lions," do you think any one would doubt that Benaiah slew that lion with a spear?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, I suppose not.

Methodist. Does it not occur to you as a *little strange* that you Campbellites can tell to a *certainty* that the eunuch was *immersed*, and when you read the account of Benaiah slaying the lion, in which it is just as plainly stated *how* he slew the lion as it is in the eighth of Acts that the eunuch was *immersed*, and you can tell *exactly* and *without a doubt*, that the eunuch was immersed, but you cannot tell *one thing* about *how* that lion was slain?

Campbellite. We will dismiss the eunuch's case, if you please.

Methodist. Not yet. Let me give you the sixth point. After the eunuch was baptized "the Spirit of the Lord caught away Philip, that the eunuch saw him no more." (Acts viii. 39.) Did you ever know such an occurrence in connection with a Campbellite baptism?

Campbellite. Of course not. Why do you ask so many foolish questions?

Methodist. You constantly urge sinners and members of other Churches to join you on the Bible, and I want to show the world just *how much of the Bible* you stand on, and that *immersion*, on which you are so firmly planted, *is not in the Bible*; so it turns out that you fight harder for *what is not in the Bible* than you do for some things which are in it. But as you

seem to be tired of the eunuch's case, we will take up Saul's baptism if it suits you.

Campbellite. Suppose we skip Saul's baptism, as that is rather difficult for us Campbellites to manage.

Methodist. O no; you go by the Bible, and Saul's baptism is recorded in the Bible, so we will examine it. And (1) "As he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven." (Acts ix. 3.) Nothing of this kind ever precedes your baptisms, I believe.

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (2) "And he fell to the earth." (Verse 4.) Do your subjects for baptism *fall on their faces* preparatory to baptism?

Campbellite. No; that would look too much like a Methodist mourners' bench, and you know how we ridicule such as that.

Methodist. (3) And he "heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" (Verse 4.) Did you ever know such an occurrence in connection with a Campbellite baptism?

Campbellite. No; that was a miracle.

Methodist. (4) "And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest." (Verse 5.) God never speaks to your subjects, I believe.

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (5) Saul said to the Lord: "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do." (Verse 6.) You don't teach your subjects to *pray*, I believe.

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, we are softening a little on that point lately.

Methodist. (6) "And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what

thou must do." (Verse 6.) You teach that God does not *hear* and *answer* the prayer of an *unimmersed* sinner, do you not?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, yes.

Methodist. (7) "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man." (Verse 7.) How would that suit Campbellism?

Campbellite. Not at all; that was in the days of miracles.

Methodist. (8) "And he was three days without sight, and neither did eat nor drink." (Verse 9.) How would that suit you?

Campbellite. That does not suit us at all in the present day.

Methodist. (9) "And there was a certain disciple at Damascus, named Ananias; and to him said the Lord *in a vision*. . . Arise, and go into the street which is called Straight, and inquire in the house of Judas for one called Saul, of Tarsus." (Verses 10, 11.) Does the Lord ever speak to you *in a vision*, telling you *where to go* and *who to call for*?

Campbellite. No; that was a miracle.

Methodist. (10) "For *behold he prayeth*," but as you are *softening* in regard to sinners praying, we will take the eleventh point. Saul had "*seen in a vision* a man named Ananias coming in, and putting his hand on him, that he might receive his sight." (Verse 12.) Your subjects *see no visions*, I believe.

Campbellite. No, sir; that was another miracle.

Methodist. (12) Ananias feared to go, "but the Lord said unto him, Go thy way: *for he is a chosen vessel unto me, to bear my name before the Gentiles, and kings, and the children of Israel*." (Verse 15.) God

does not *choose* Campbellite preachers before they are immersed, I believe; and he does not *call* them to preach even after they are immersed, I believe.

Campbellite. You know we do not believe in a divine call to the ministry: that is too much like the Methodists.

Methodist. (13) When Ananias entered into the house where Saul was, he put his hands on him, and said: "*Brother Saul.*" (Verse 17.) Do you call un-immersed sinners *brother*?

Campbellite. It is not our custom to call *even the sects* brother, but we are coming a little on that now; some of us call the *sects* brother, but I doubt its being right.

Methodist. (14) Ananias said to Saul: "The Lord, even Jesus, . . . *hath sent me*, that thou mightest receive thy sight, and be FILLED WITH THE HOLY GHOST." (Verse 17.) Did you ever tell a penitent sinner that the Lord had sent you to him?

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. Did you ever tell a sinner that God had sent you to him, "*that he might be filled with the Holy Ghost?*"

Campbellite. No; that was in the days of miracles.

Methodist. (15) "And immediately there fell from his eyes as it had been scales." (Verse 18.) You never saw any thing like that, did you?

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (16) "And he received sight forthwith, and AROSE, and was baptized." (Verse 18.) Campbellite subjects always LIE DOWN and are immersed, I believe.

Campbellite. W-e-l-l o-f c-o-u-r-s-e w-e—

Methodist. Come, my brother, did you ever know a

Campbellite preacher to baptize a person *in a private residence, standing on his feet*, as Saul was baptized.

Campbellite. To be honest I must answer: No, sir.

Methodist. Now we have noticed *sixteen* points connected with Saul's baptism which you do not claim are connected with Campbellite baptism, but you claim that immersion must be connected with all Campbellite baptisms; and this you utterly fail to find connected with Saul's baptism. Now does it not seem strange indeed that the points we have noticed, which the Bible plainly states were connected with the baptism we have noticed, are points which you do not claim as essential to a scriptural baptism *now*, and that the *immersion* you do claim is not *once named* in connection with baptism or any thing else, *and yet you go by the Bible alone, and are the only people who do go by it.*

Campbellite. I have always thought it would be hard to prove that Saul was immersed; it cannot be done if we just take the case as it reads, but there may be some things connected with his baptism that are not recorded.

Methodist. Possibly so; and if so, it would be a *mere guess* as to what those things were, and my guess would be worth as much as yours, and neither of our guesses would be *worth a bean*. It is safe to say that every thing connected with Saul's baptism that is of *any importance is recorded*.

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, yes; I suppose so.

Methodist. It is certain that none of the circumstances recorded are favorable to *immersion* in Saul's case, but all the circumstances are favorable to *pouring*.

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, I think we have said enough

about Saul's case, and if it suits you we will notice the baptism of Cornelius and his friends. I think they were immersed.

Methodist. You think so, but the word does not say so. Now I will state that there is not a case of baptism recorded in the Bible where it would have been inconvenient to administer it by *pouring the water*, and in *every case* the water could have been poured without *adding to, or taking from*, any of the facts recorded in connection with the baptisms mentioned in the Bible, whereas, in a *large majority* of the baptisms recorded, to get immersion, *many things* must be *taken for granted* which are not recorded in the Bible.

Campbellite. Yes, I suppose you are right about that, but I think immersion was certainly the Bible mode.

Methodist. You think, but we will now notice the baptism at the house of Cornelius in order, and (1) Cornelius was a man who "feared God," "gave much alms," "and prayed to God always." (Acts x. 2.) All this before he was baptized. Do you teach that God will answer the prayer of one who has not been baptized?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, we are a little more cautious as to what we say about sinners praying than we used to be.

Methodist. (2) In answer to his prayer, "he saw in a vision evidently, about the ninth hour of the day, an angel of God coming in to him, and saying unto him, Cornelius." (Verse 3.) You don't teach sinners to pray, and expect visions before baptism, I believe.

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. (3) The angel said unto him: "Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial before God." (Verse 4.) I believe you teach that an unimmersed sinner's prayers are not answered, do you not?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, we are not quite so hard on that point as we used to be, but we never tell sinners to pray.

Methodist. (4) Again the angel said: "And now send men to Joppa, and call for one Simon, whose surname is Peter. . . . He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do." (Verses 5, 6.) What about all this?

Campbellite. That was a miracle.

Methodist. (5) Peter saw a *vision* which taught him that he must not call those for whom Jesus died, common. (Verses 9-18.) Your preachers never see visions, I believe.

Campbellite. No; that was in the days of miracles.

Methodist. (6) When the three men sent by Cornelius came to the place where Peter was, "*the Spirit said* unto him, Behold, three men seek thee. Arise therefore, . . . and go with them, doubting nothing: for I have sent them." (Verses 19, 20.) The Spirit never speaks to Campbellite preachers, telling them to go and preach, I believe.

Campbellite. No; that was another miracle.

Methodist. (7) When Peter reached the house of Cornelius, Cornelius said: "Four days ago I was fasting until this hour; and at the ninth hour *I prayed in my house.*" (Verse 30.) What do you think of an unbaptized *alien* (as you call unimmersed people) holding family prayers?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, we never advise *aliens* to hold family prayers.

Methodist. (8) When the angel of God (verse 3) came in to Cornelius, he said: "Cornelius, *thy prayer is heard.*" (Verse 31.) Now do you not teach that all men are *aliens* until they are *immersed*, and that God will not hear the prayers of an *alien*?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, we have *softened* a little in regard to the prayer of an *alien*, as I told you before. But you must remember that the angel said to Cornelius, send for Peter, and "he shall tell thee *what thou oughtest to do.*" (Verse 6.) Now that is our doctrine: we believe in *doing* religion.

Methodist. But what about *pardon* and *regeneration*? Can a sinner *do pardon of his past sins*? can he *do regeneration*? can he *do the new birth born of the Spirit*?

Campbellite. Why pardon takes place in the mind of God.

Methodist. But does the sinner *do this pardon*?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, of course not, but he *does what God commands*, and then God *pardons his sins*.

Methodist. But where does the *new birth* take place? Is that something done *in the sinner's heart*, or in God's? Is it something a sinner *can do*? or is it something God *does in the sinner*?

Campbellite. Ah, now you want to get off on some great miraculous something that nobody understands, and you Methodists are always talking about.

Methodist. But you say the sinner does what God commands, and then God pardons him. Now will you abide by what Peter gave at the house of Cornelius as the condition of pardon?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l of course, I think a sinner must *believe, repent, confess*, and be *immersed* before he can be pardoned.

Methodist. (9) We will hear Peter. Now let us remember that Peter said *not one word about being immersed*, in his sermon in the house of Cornelius, so far as the record shows; so all that you claim for immersion here must be claimed on *supposition*, just as you claim it in all other cases in the Bible. But as to the terms of "*remission of sins*" given by Peter at the house of Cornelius, we are not left to *guess* or *suppose*. Hear him: "To him [Jesus] give all the prophets witness, that through his name whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." (Verse 43.) Now there is the only condition of pardon given by Peter on this occasion. Do you give sinners the same condition?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, we always have *immersion* as one of the conditions of pardon.

Methodist. (10) Then you will not take just what Peter says, without adding something he did not say—*immersion*. But before Peter gave any command about baptism "*the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word.*" (Verse 44.) Do you teach sinners to expect the Holy Ghost to fall upon them through faith in Jesus *before they have been immersed*?

Campbellite. No, sir; I do not believe that the Holy Ghost falling upon sinners is essential to pardon; I think that ceased with the apostolic age.

Methodist. Then you teach that the falling of the Holy Ghost upon the people at the house of Cornelius *was not essential to the forgiveness of their sins*, though the record plainly states that he did fall on all that heard the word. But you do teach that *immersion is essential to pardon*, though the record says *not one word about immersion*—that is, you teach that

the Bible states some things that took place at the house of Cornelius *which are not essential to pardon*, while it *fails to state some things which are essential to pardon*, and you are the only people in the world who go *EXACTLY BY THE BIBLE!* Well, well!

Campbellite. But you are off the subject. We are discussing the *mode* of baptism; stick to the subject.

Methodist. Very well. Now show me your proof for immersion in this case.

Campbellite. Why "Cæsarea, the home of Cornelius, was situated on the sea," and of course Cornelius and his friends were immersed.

Methodist. (11) A fine argument (?). It proves immersion in this case about as clearly as the doctor proved that his patient had eaten a horse. He said there could be no doubt as to his having eaten a horse, *for the bridle and saddle were under his bed!* But what saith the Scriptures? Peter says: "Can any man *forbid water*, that these should not be baptized, which *have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?*" (Verse 47.) Do you take this for a *command to go to the sea for immersion*, or does the language convey the idea that the *water was to be brought to the subjects?* "*WHO CAN FORBID WATER?*"

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, I—if you please we will leave the case of Cornelius and his friends.

Methodist. You will admit, then, that if we stick strictly to the word of God, we will not find immersion at the house of Cornelius. You only *suppose* immersion.

Campbellite. Of course *I think* they were immersed as they were so near the sea, but I must admit that the language does not justify my conclusion. Let us

now look at the baptism of Lydia and her household. Now I am sure they were *immersed*, for St. Paul and his companions left the city of Philippi, and “*went out by a river side.*” (Acts xvi. 13.) Now why did they “*go out by a river side,*” unless it was to *immerse*?

Methodist. Let us read more of that same verse, and see if it will not tell us *just why* they went out there. “And on the Sabbath we went out of the city by a river side, *where prayer was wont to be made.*” (Verse 13.) Here we see the reason why they went out there—it was the place where they were accustomed to pray. This is the reason given as to *why* they went there, but you say they went there so they could *immerse*. Well, as usual, the Bible gives one reason for their going out there, and you give another. Now, if their object was to *immerse*, would it not have been *just as easy*, and *much more correct*, to have said: “they went out by a river side where *immersion* was wont to be performed?” Honestly, now?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, it may seem so to you.

Methodist. Yes, it does seem *very so* to me; the fact is, it seems to me that if *immersion* is the Bible mode of baptism, it was a great oversight in the writers of the New Testament to fail to say so *anywhere*, while *sprinkle, pour, shed forth, come upon, fell upon*, are all mentioned in connection with baptism. Just a question here: If Isaiah had said *right in close connection with the eunuch's baptism*, “*So shall he IMMERSE many nations,*” don't you think you Campbellites would have thought one very stupid indeed who would have denied that the eunuch was immersed?

Campbellite. I suppose we would, for we are inclined to think so of those who deny that he was *immersed*,

though Isaiah did say right in connection with where the eunuch was reading just before his baptism, "So shall he *sprinkle* many nations." (Isa. lii. 15.)

Methodist. Well, if God said in a prophecy which was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost, "Then will I *immerse* you in *clean water*," you would have no patience with one who would say the three thousand at Pentecost were not immersed, would you?

Campbellite. No, sir; for we have but little patience with such people any way, though God did say in a prophecy which seems to have been fulfilled at Pentecost, "Then will I *sprinkle clean water upon you*." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.)

Methodist. We have been just a little off from Lydia's baptism. Now it turns out that the only evidence you have that Lydia and her household were immersed is based upon the fact that they "went out by a river side, *where prayer was wont to be made*." That is in keeping with what I have often said: "If immersion is proved at all it must be proved by *circumstances*, and not by Scripture." As for me, I would be *very slow* to tell the world that *immersion* is the Bible mode of baptism, when I had to prove it by *circumstances*, the Bible failing to furnish the proof; and more especially if I believed as you do, that the salvation of the world *depended on immersion*. If the salvation of the world *depends on immersion*, as you Campbellites teach, what a great pity the writers of the New Testament did not give us some *positive* proof that *immersion* is the Bible mode of baptism, and not leave us to *guess at it*. Does it not look so to you?

Campbellite. W-el-l, let us leave the baptism of Lydia, and take up the baptism of the Corinthians,

as recorded in Acts xviii. 8. Now "Corinth was situated on the sea, and was famous for her two harbors," and of course the Corinthians were immersed.

Methodist. I think you have made about as good an argument in favor of the immersion of the Corinthians as you could make, and like all of your arguments in favor of immersion, it is based upon *supposition*, and not on Scripture. Now let me give you just what the Bible says about the baptism of the Corinthians. "And Crispus, the chief ruler of the synagogue, believed on the Lord with all his house; and many of the Corinthians hearing believed, and were baptized." (Acts xviii. 8.) Now don't you see that the Bible is *silent as death* in regard to immersion here, just as it is in every case of baptism recorded in the Bible?

Campbellite. Of course I must admit that the Bible is silent on the subject, But Corinth, as I said, was situated on the sea, and it does seem that that is favorable to immersion. But as we can't agree about this case, suppose we take the case of the twelve disciples whose baptism is recorded in Acts xix. I reckon you will not deny that they were immersed.

Methodist. We will read all that is said about it, and see if we can find immersion. "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." (Verse 5.) What are your *circumstances* to prove immersion here?

Campbellite. Well, Paul "passed through the *upper coasts*," and came to Ephesus. (Verse 1.) So you see there must have been water there, or there could not have been *coasts*. *Certainly* this favors *immersion*. Now why did Paul pass through the *upper coasts* if it

was not to have water convenient to *immerse* any whom he might meet?

Methodist. Yes, the *exact reading* is: "Paul having passed through the upper coasts *came to Ephesus*: and finding certain disciples," etc. (Verse 1.) So Paul found these disciples *at Ephesus*, and not *on the coast* as he was going to Ephesus; but that is about the best you can do toward proving immersion in this case. But Paul "laid his hands upon them," and "the Holy Ghost came on them; and they spake with tongues, and prophesied." (Verse 6.) Now you think *immersion is absolutely essential to pardon*, but what about the facts stated in this sixth verse?

Campbellite. O that was a miracle, of course; but we can get at the mode of baptism, it seems, in a way that ought to be satisfactory to all people. Now if we go to the Greek lexicons, what will we find as the definition of the word which is called *baptism* in King James's version?

Methodist. I think we can find the definition of that word in the Bible, and if we can, you would prefer that, would you not?

Campbellite. Certainly, but can you find it in the Bible?

Methodist. Jesus says: "But ye shall receive power, after that the Holy Ghost is *come upon you*." (Acts i. 8.) Here Jesus defines the word "*Come upon*." Joel, Peter, and God, define it thus: "In the last days, saith God, I will *pour out* of my Spirit upon all flesh." (Acts ii. 17.) "*Pour out*" is God's, Joel's, and Peter's definition of baptize. Luke defines it thus: "The Holy Ghost *fell on* all them which heard the word." (Acts x. 44.) "*Fell on*." "He hath *shed forth* this

which ye now see and hear." Spoken of in the future, he was to be "*poured out*," "*come upon*." Spoken of in the past, he was "*shed forth*," "*fell upon*." Now here is the *Divine* definition of baptize; and why reject it, and get up a long list of *circumstances* to try to prove that God, Christ, Joel, Peter, and Luke, all gave the wrong definition? Does this *Divine* definition of *baptize* suit you?

Campbellite. O that was given in reference to Holy Ghost baptism; we are talking about "*water baptism*."

Methodist. Then the word *baptize*, when referring to *Holy Ghost baptism*, means *pour out*, and when referring to *water baptism* it means *immerse*, does it?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, I'll study that point some. I am not so well satisfied about that, but there are a few other cases of baptism mentioned in the Bible, which, I suppose, it would not do us much good to notice now, for I am getting tired of this matter.

Methodist. I suppose you are. I noticed how you skipped the baptism of the jailer and his house; I suppose that is like Saul's baptism for you—rather hard to manage; but let us notice it a little. The circumstances connected with the jailer's baptism are as follows: 1. A damsel possessed with a spirit of divination brought her masters much gain. 2. She cried after Paul and his companions. 3. Paul cast the evil spirit out of her in the name of Jesus Christ. 4. This offended her masters because their hope of gains was gone. 5. Her masters caught Paul and Silas and brought them before the rulers. 6. The multitude rose up against them, and the magistrates commanded to beat them. 7. When they had laid many stripes on them, they cast them into prison,

charging the jailer to keep them safely. 8. The jailer thrust them into the inner prison. 9. At midnight Paul and Silas prayed and sung praises unto God. 10. A great earthquake came shaking the foundation of the prison. 11. Immediately the prison doors were opened, and every one's bonds were loosed. 12. The keeper of the prison was aroused from his sleep, and seeing the prison doors opened, supposed the prisoners had fled, took a sword, and was about to kill himself. 13. Paul said to him: "Do thyself no harm: for we are all here." 14. The jailer came trembling, and fell down before Paul and Silas. 15. He brought them out of the inner prison. 16. He said: "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" 17. And they said: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house." (I never heard a Campbellite answer that question that way.) 18. "And they spake unto him the word of the Lord, and to all that were in his house." 19. "And he took them the same hour of the night, and washed their stripes; and was baptized, he and all his, straightway." 20. After the baptism he brought them into his house. (Acts xvi. 16-34.) Now remember, the apostles were put *into the prison* by the authority of the magistrates; then they were *thrust into the inner prison* by the jailer. So here are *two ins*, and only *one out*. The jailer brought them out of the *inner prison* where he had put them, into the *outer prison* where the authorities had put them, and there the baptism took place. Now where is your immersion?

Campbellite. Well, you have ridiculed me so much about *supposing*, I believe I will just let that case stand as the Bible gives it. But I would like to talk

with you about the *burial* in baptism mentioned in Romans vi. 4 and Colossians ii. 12; but I remember that you considered those passages at some length in the "Pump."

Methodist. I wish to make only one remark in connection with what I said in regard to the two texts you referred to, and that is, you Campbellites bury the wrong man when you *immerse* men; we bury *dead folks*, not live ones. Now if you will notice the sixth chapter of Romans, you will find: (1) *A crucifixion*. "Knowing this, that *OUR OLD MAN IS CRUCIFIED* with him." (Verse 6.) (2) *A death*. "Therefore we are buried with him by baptism *into death*." (Verse 4.) The idea is: in Holy Ghost baptism *the old man of sin is CRUCIFIED, DEAD, and BURIED*, but you Campbellites bury a *live man* in your immersion.

Campbellite. We will dismiss this case if you please; but I want to ask you one question: If immersion is not the Bible mode of baptism, why is it stated so many times in the New Testament that they *went to water to be baptized*?

Methodist. I know that is the way you Campbellites talk about it, but you may be surprised when I tell you that the New Testament does not say *one word* about the multitude going to water to be baptized. Let us read Matthew iii. 5: "Then went out *to him* [John] Jerusalem, and all Judea, and all the region round about Jordan." (Mark i. 5.) "And there went *unto him* [John] all the land of Judea." The people *went unto John*. If he baptized in Jordan, they *went to him*; if he baptized *beyond Jordan* (John x. 40), the people *went to him*; if he baptized *in the wilderness*, the people *went to him*; if *in Enon* or *in Bethabara*,

the people *went to him*. So all that has been said about *going to water for immersion* amounts to nothing.

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, I had not noticed that. And the fact is, I begin to see that there is some good scriptural argument in favor of *sprinkling* and *pouring*, as the Bible mode of baptism. But there is one other case of baptism mentioned in the Bible, and it seems to me that it favors immersion: that is, the baptism of the Israelites as they crossed the Red Sea. The water was a *wall on each side*, and the cloud was *over them*, so that formed a *complete immersion*.

Methodist. By reference to Exodus xiv. 22 we find that the children of Israel “*went into the midst of the sea upon the dry ground.*” In Nehemiah ix. 11 we learn that they “*went through the midst of the sea on the dry land.*” Is there any intimation that the Israelites were *off their feet* at any time while crossing the Red Sea?

Campbellite. No, sir.

Methodist. Is it not plainly stated that they *passed over on dry ground*?

Campbellite. Yes, sir.

Methodist. Can you show me how the Israelites could be baptized *on dry ground, on their feet*, as the Campbellites *immerse* now.

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, I suppose not.

Methodist. Now St. Paul tells us in first Corinthians x. 2 that the Israelites *were all baptized*, and David tells us in Psalm lxxvii. 17 just how it was done: “*The clouds poured out water.*” To my mind this settles the matter. The mode of baptism was *pouring*. Now if you will agree to baptize me *on dry ground, on my feet*, and make it agree with Campbellite im-

mersion; or if you will agree to baptize me *in a private house on my feet*, as Saul was baptized, and make it agree with Campbellite immersion, I will allow you to baptize me just to learn how it can be done. What say you?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, I believe I will not undertake it. The fact is, you made one remark since we have been talking on this subject which I have considered well, and it is strictly true.

Methodist. To what remark do you refer?

Campbellite. You said: "There is no case of baptism recorded in the Bible where you would have to go outside of the record, or suppose any thing that is not plainly stated in the Bible, in order to make it convenient to *pour* or *sprinkle* the water on the subject; but in a large majority of the baptisms recorded you must go beyond what is written, and *suppose* something which the Bible does not say, in order to make immersion even *convenient*, much less prove that immersion is the only Bible mode of baptism." I must say in all candor, that statement is true, and the more I think of it the more I am inclined to the opinion that we have been mistaken in stating so often that you Methodists had no Bible authority for sprinkling and pouring. Really I am surprised how much we must *suppose* in order to make every case of baptism mentioned in the Bible a case of immersion.

Methodist. Then inasmuch as we have "*sprinkle*," "*pour out*," "*shed forth*," "*fell upon*," "*come upon*," all connected with baptism in the Bible; and inasmuch as *immersion*, *dip*, *plunge*, or any thing of the kind, is not *once named* in the Bible in connection with baptism; and inasmuch as *sprinkling* or *pouring* would

have been exactly *convenient* and *easy* in every case of baptism mentioned in the Bible without "*adding to*" or "*taking from*" the record *one word, syllable, or letter*; and inasmuch as in many cases of baptism recorded in the Bible immersion would have been *altogether inconvenient*, and in such cases as the baptism of *Saul*, and the *jailer and all his*, immersion would have been *impossible* if you take the record *just as it stands*—now in view of all these facts, don't you think we Methodists are safe in *sprinkling* or *pouring* water in baptism, seeing that we neither have to *add to* or *take from* the written word of God to get authority for so doing?

Campbellite. I must confess, sir, that I am a little at sea on the mode of baptism just now, and will consider this matter more closely than I have done before.

Methodist. Well, don't you think it *rather presumptuous* for you Campbellites to *assume* that immersion is the Bible mode of baptism, and then *assume* that there is no pardon of past sins without immersion, and then *assume* that all Methodists and all others who have not been immersed will be eternally lost?

Campbellite. W-e-l-l, we are softening a little on that point now. You have noticed in the *Gospel Advocate*, I suppose, that we do not pretend to say what God may do in his *uncovenanted mercy*. He may save some who have not been immersed, but they have no promise of salvation *short of immersion*.

Methodist. Yes, I have noticed that kind of talk in the *Gospel Advocate*, but do not remember to have seen any thing in the Bible about the *uncovenanted mercy* of God. What does the Bible say about that?

Campbellite. I-I—w-e-l-l—I don't remember that it says any thing, but we—

Methodist. Hold a moment; you Campbellites have more to say about things the Bible does not say than any people I ever saw who claim to go *just exactly by the Bible in every thing*. How far you do miss it in many things, and *immersion* is one of those things!

Campbellite. I have been thinking of the points you made since we began to talk. 1. You showed that there are *eleven* points of difference between Campbellite immersion and Christ's baptism. 2. That John *sprinkled* the water on Jesus. 3. That none of the things we Campbellites demand of a sinner before baptism were demanded of Jesus before his baptism. 4. That there are eleven points of difference between Campbellite immersion and the baptism of the three thousand at Pentecost. 5. The baptism of the three thousand at Pentecost was the fulfillment of a prophecy which said: "Then will I *sprinkle* clean water upon you." (Ezek. xxxvi. 25.) 6. That there are eight points of difference between the things connected with the baptism of the Samaritans and Campbellite *immersion*. 7. That *immersion*, the thing for which we so earnestly contend, is not once named in the Bible. 8. That many things which the Bible states occurred in connection with New Testament baptism are rejected by us. 9. That there are six points connected with the eunuch's baptism which are not connected with Campbellite immersion. 10. That there are sixteen points connected with Saul's baptism which are not connected with Campbellite immersion. 11. That nothing connected with the baptism of Cornelius and his friends indicates immer-

sion. 12. That if Lydia and her household were immersed, the Bible fails to say so. 13. That the Corinthians were not immersed so far as the record shows. 14. That there is not the slightest intimation that the twelve whom Paul baptized were immersed. 15. That the Bible definition of baptize is "*pour out*," etc. 16. That it would take a *long stretch of supposition* to get immersion in the jailer's case. 17. That the Israelites were not immersed in crossing the Red Sea, but the cloud *poured out water*. 18. And that if immersion is proved to be the Bible mode of baptism, it must be proved by *supposition*, as the Bible is *silent as death* about immersion.

Methodist. One other question: If immersion is essential to salvation, and *immersion* is proved to be the Bible mode of baptism *by supposition*, then does it not follow that man's salvation is based on a *supposition*?

Campbellite. It does seem so; and I am resolved to stop my part of this constant howling about *immersion*, *immersion*; which has been sounding on the hills and in the vales, and along the shores of all the streams in this land, ever since the days of Alexander Campbell.

Methodist. Good, my brother. Let your motto be "More of the Holy Spirit, and less of the water."

Campbellite. I will do so by the help of God. I am glad we met, and had this friendly conversation, and with best wishes for your spiritual welfare I bid you farewell.

Date Due

APR 4 '63



PRINTED IN U. S. A.

LIBRARY RULES

1. No book may be taken from the library without being charged to the borrower. Borrowers are responsible for any damage done to the volumes while in their possession and are expected to make good all losses.
2. (a) Reserve Books may be borrowed for a period of two hours. In case no call has been made in the interval, books may be renewed for a second two hours. (Where there is only one copy, book must be used in the library.)
(b) Reserve books taken at 10 p.m. Mondays to Fridays are due at 9 a.m. the next morning. A reserve book taken from the library at 12 m. Saturday is due at 9 a.m. the following Monday.
3. Books not on reserve may be drawn from the library for two weeks and may be renewed once for the same period. One-day books.
4. A fine of five cents is charged for each book not returned to the library on the due date.

H. Nichols, J. O. The sprinkler

042
UG22
N51

28720

MORE THAN 391,000 SOLD

POPULAR WORKS

By REV. J. H. NICHOLS

Of the Tennessee Conference

THE RIGHT OF A SINNER TO PRAY.—An unanswerable argument, based on "Thus saith the Lord." Eighteen thousand copies have been sold. Price, 5 cents; 50 cents per dozen, by mail.

THEOLOGICAL GRUB-AX.—A great error grubbed up by the roots. Infant baptism plainly taught in the Bible. Fifty thousand copies have been sold. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL PUMP.—The water pumped out of Campbellism. Twenty-eight thousand copies have been sold. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE FURNACE.—A treatise on Depravity, Capacity of the Soul, Divine Influence of the Holy Spirit, etc. Twelve thousand copies have been sold. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE SHIPWRECK.—A treatise on Apostasy and Close Communion. Ten thousand copies have been sold. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE CURRYCOMB curries Campbellism nicely for 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE SPRINKLER.—No dipping for baptism found in the Bible. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

A FRIENDLY TALK on the Second Blessing. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE WHEEL.—Religious Organization God's Order. The Methodist Church Organized on the Apostolic Basis. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

BIBLE TOOLS FOR BUSY PEOPLE.—A collection of all the author's pamphlets into one volume, with additional new matter. With the author's picture. 12mo, cloth, pp. vi, 375. Price, \$1, by mail.

ANALOGY; or, The Second Blessing Theory of Sanctification Considered from the Standpoint of Saul's Conversion, and an Argument by Analogy and the Bible. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE GOLDEN CANDLESTICK.—The Church symbolized as a candlestick made of pure gold. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

A CALL TO PREACH, viewed from a Bible standpoint. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

THE TEMPLE OF GOD, viewed as typical of the Church of God. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

SPRINKLING AND MUSIC.—By what authority sprinkling got into the Church; musical instruments got into the Church, etc. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

MY FATHER'S HOUSE.—A Treatise on Eternal Damnation Worked Out, and Eternal Salvation Worked Out. Price, 10 cents; \$1 per dozen, by mail.

For any of the above pamphlets, send to

SMITH & LAMAR, Agents

PUBLISHING HOUSE M. E. CHURCH, SOUTH

NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE